

REMARKS

Claims 5-9 are in this application. By this amendment, claims 5-9, have been amended. Re-examination, reconsideration and allowance of this application is respectfully requested. No new matter is added.

The amendment to the specification corrects a spelling error. Claim 5 has been amended to explicitly recite that the practitioner's selections are from the main document database. It is believed that the scope of the claim is unchanged from that originally presented, and that the amendment merely facilitates proper reading of the claim. Support for the amendment to claim 1 is found in the specification at page 12, lines 24-27, page 13, lines 2-5 and the sentence continuing to page 14, line 3.

Claims 6-9 have been amended to correct their dependencies, the dependencies as originally presented having been automatically generated with claim 5 as numbered 8 in a preliminary draft. Claims 6 and 7 have been further amended to clarify that respective practitioner-specific and client-specific data is included "in pages of the home document sets being transmitted" Support for these amendments is found in the specification at page

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. 112

Claims 6-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for having improper dependencies. Claims 6 and 7 have been amended to depend from claim 5; claim 8 has been amended to depend from claim 7; and claim 9 has been amended to depend from claim 8. Accordingly, it is believed that the rejection of claims 6-9 under 25 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph has been overcome by the amendment; withdrawal thereof is requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

Claims 5-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by the Legal Anywhere Collaborator reference (LAC herein). It was suggested that LAC teaches maintaining a main document database, registering practitioners, processing document selections of practitioners to identify respective home document sets, identifying requesting users as clients of corresponding practitioners, processing client requests and transmitting requested pages of home document sets to particular clients, maintaining practitioner-specific and client-specific databases and including practitioner-specific and client-specific portions of the database in pages transmitted to clients, maintaining client data and tracking client access to the home document sets.

The rejection of claims 5-9 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) is believed to be inappropriate as to Applicants' amended claims because neither the LAC reference nor any of the other references discloses any of the following:

1. The combination of a main document database with means for subscriber selection therefrom of respective home document sets for access by clients of corresponding practitioners;
2. The above combination, with maintenance of a practitioners database, and including practitioner-specific portions of the practitioners database in pages transmitted to clients; and
3. The first combination, with maintenance of a client database, and including client-specific portions of the client database in pages transmitted to clients.

It is respectfully submitted that none of the references is in anticipation of Applicant's invention. As the CCPA has stated:

"Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102 are proper only where the claimed subject matter is identically disclosed or described in prior art (citation). In other words, to constitute an anticipation, all material elements recited in a claim must be found in one unit of prior art." *In re Marshall*, 198 USPQ 344, 346 (CCPA 1973).

It is clear that none of the references that were cited by the Examiner nor any of the other references satisfies this test. Applicants emphasize that as to the rejected claim 5 as amended, the LAC reference discloses nothing regarding maintenance of a main document database from which practitioners select home document sets. The LAC product thus can not be in anticipation of Applicants' claimed invention in that "home document sets" of practitioners are supplied by the practitioners, rather than being selected from a common set, and are thus independent of each other.

The rejected claims are also non-obvious in view of the references in that none of the references discloses or suggests Applicants' maintenance of a main document database from which practitioners select home document sets. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request allowance of claim 5 as amended.

The dependent claims are also believed allowable based on allowance of claim 5 and because they further limit allowable subject matter. Further regarding claims 6 and 7, nothing in the LAC reference discloses or suggests insertion of practitioner-specific and/or client-specific information in pages of home document sets that are selected from a main document

database by practitioners to be accessible by clients of the practitioners. Further regarding claims 8 and 9, it is believed that the term "tracking and storage" in the LAC reference fails to disclose or suggest Applicant's *maintaining client statistics* (claim 8), and it is unclear whether "tracking" means *tracking client access* (claim 9).

Accordingly, it is believed that the rejection of claims 5-9 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) has been overcome by the amendment and remarks; allowance thereof is respectfully requested.

Attached hereto is a marked-up version of the changes made to the specification, abstract and claims by the current amendment. The attached page is captioned "Version with markings to show changes made."

In view of the above, it is believed that this application, including each of the claims 1-9, is in condition for allowance. Such allowance is respectfully requested. If for some reason the Examiner considers otherwise, it is respectfully requested that a telephone call be placed to the undersigned so that issuance of a patent can be expedited.

Respectfully submitted,

SHELDON & MAK

Date: 21 October 2002 By Stephen R. Seccombe
Stephen R. Seccombe
Reg. No. 31,136

225 South Lake Avenue, 9th Floor
Pasadena, California 91101
(626) 796-4000)

VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE

In the specification:

The paragraph beginning on line 20 of page 14 has been amended as follows:

Of course, many variations of the above may be appropriate. Anything that is stored in the practitioner/client database(s) can be displayed on the document pages, so that they can ~~br~~ be personalized messages.

In the claims:

Claims 5-9 have been amended as follows:

in3 5. (Amended) A method for processing data requests from clients of particular practitioners on a distributed computer network, the method comprising the steps of:

- (a) maintaining a main document database;
- (b) registering the practitioners;
- (c) processing document selections of the practitioners from the main document database to identify respective home document sets of the practitioners;
- (d) identifying requesting users as clients of corresponding practitioners;
- (e) processing client requests for permitting access by particular clients to the home document sets of corresponding practitioners; and

(f) transmitting requested pages of the home document sets to the particular clients.

m3a 6. (Amended) The method of claim ~~6~~ 5, further comprising maintaining a practitioner database, and including practitioner-specific portions of the practitioner database in pages of the home document sets being transmitted to the particular clients.

m3b 7. (Amended) The method of claim ~~6~~ 5, further comprising maintaining a client database, and including client-specific portions of the client database in pages of the home document sets being transmitted to the particular clients.

m3b1 8. (Amended) The method of claim ~~10~~ 7, further comprising maintaining client data and/or statistics of the particular clients in the client database.

m3b1a 9. (Amended) The method of claim ~~11~~ 8, further comprising tracking client access to the home document sets.

m3 5. (Amended) A method for processing data requests from clients of particular practitioners on a distributed computer network, the method comprising the steps of:

- (a) maintaining a main document database;
- (b) registering the practitioners;
- (c) processing document selections of the practitioners from the main document database to identify respective home document sets of the practitioners;
- (d) identifying requesting users as clients of corresponding practitioners;
- (e) processing client requests for permitting access by particular clients to the home document sets of corresponding practitioners; and
- (f) transmitting requested pages of the home document sets to the particular clients.

m3a 6. (Amended) The method of claim ~~6~~ 5, further comprising maintaining a practitioner database, and including practitioner-specific portions of the practitioner database in pages of the home document sets being transmitted to the particular clients.

m3b 7. (Amended) The method of claim ~~6~~ 5, further comprising maintaining a client database, and including client-specific portions of the client database in pages of the home document sets being transmitted to the particular clients.

m3b1 8. (Amended) The method of claim ~~10~~ 7, further comprising maintaining client data and/or statistics of the particular clients in the client database.

m3b1a 9. (Amended) The method of claim ~~11~~ 8, further comprising tracking client access to the home document sets.